DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 335 **FL 011 127**

AUTHOR	Berman, Ruth A.
TITLE	The Re-Emergence of a Bilingual: A Case Study of a Hebrew-English Speaking Child. Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 19.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto. Bilingual Education Project.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	23p.: Best copy available.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingualism; *Child Language; *Code Switching (Language); Communicative Competence (Languages); *Interference (Language); *Language Acquisition; Language Dominance; Language Processing; Language Research; Personality; *Second Language Learning; Social Influences

ABSTRACT

Insight into processes involved in child bilingualism is provided by this account of the "primary language acquisition" (in the sense of Lamendella, 1977) of two languages, English and Hebrew, by a 4 1/2 year old subject. The child's re-entry into her first language, Hebrew, after a year spent in an all-English environment, is traced. Of central concern to the discussion are the transitions between Stage I (understanding Hebrew and English but speaking only Hebrew), Stage II (all-English) and her emergence as a full bilingual after her return to the United States. This development is traced in terms of processes such as language-mixing and code-switching, with specific attention to the developmental errors in the subject's Hebrew. These errors are accompanied by increasing evidence of systematic transfer of syntactic patterns from Hebrew into English usage, but not vice versa. The overall pattern of development is analysed in terms of factors of personality and social situation as well as of the cognitive and linguistic tasks faced by the child in attaining bilingual competence in her two languages. (Author/PMJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth A. Berman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED184335

The Re-emergence of a Bilingual: A Case Study of a Hebrew-English Speaking Child*

Ruth A. Berman
Department of Linguistics, Tel Aviv University

This study is an account of "primary language acquisition" (in the sense of Lamendella 1977) of two languages - English and Hebrew - by a single child, with the aim of providing more general insight into processes entailed by child bilingualism. The subject is the author's own child, Shelli, aged 4½ at the time of writing. As described in two earlier studies of her linguistic development (Berman 1977 and Berman 1979 , both on the one-word stage), Shelli was born into a generally Hebrew-speaking environment in which both her natively English-speaking parents addressed her almost exclusively in English. To date, her history reflects three different types of interplay between the two languages, as follows:

STAGE	AGE	COUNTRY		SPEAKS	UNDERSTANDS	LANGUAGE USE
I	to 2;11	Israel	HEB	+	+	Semi-bilingual
			ENG	-	+	
II	3;5 to 4;1	U.S.A.	HEB	-	-	Mono-lingual
			ENG	+	+	
III	4;3 to now	Israel	HEB	+	+	Fully bilingual
			ENG	+	+	

Of central concern to this discussion are the transitions between Stage I of understanding Hebrew and English but speaking only Hebrew and the switch to all-English in Stage II six months after arrival in the U.S. and, more particularly, between Stage II and her emergence as a full bilingual in speaking and understanding both languages from her return to Israel at age 3;11 and the present time, when she is aged 4;6.

FL011127

1. BACKGROUND TO THE CHILD'S BILINGUALISM

Below we briefly review the period preceding Shelli's emergence as a speaker of both H(ebrew) and E(nglish) at around age four. Data were collected as follows: Throughout the one-word stage, till age 1;11, detailed handwritten notes were taken of each "word" said by the child with rich contextual comment, and her post-babbling "jargonizing" was tape-recorded approximately once a week; during the period of her emergent syntax, from age 1;11 to 2;11, she was tape-recorded at home when at play and in conversation every two weeks, and handwritten notes were made of utterances observed in between which seemed of developmental interest; only sporadic notes were taken of her usage in both

Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 19.

languages between her arrival in the U.S. at age 2:11 and her switch to all English some six months later; since then, she has again been tape-recorded at home every two weeks with supplementary handwritten notes. The more detailed procedures used to record her during the period crucial to this study - her first six months back in Israel - are noted further in Section 2 below.

Stage I: Hebrew-Producing - to age 2 years 11 mos.

By a month before her third birthday, Shelli was speaking fluently in Hebrew at a level consistent with that of the general cognitive, social, and linguistic maturity of her monolingual peers[1]. She had from birth had extensive H input from her adult siblings, from neighbors, relatives, a regular baby-sitter, and so on, and from age 2.0 had attended a daily, all-Hebrew nursery school. Although both her parents and her grandmother spoke only English to her, she spoke Hebrew alone, irrespective of interlocutor, except for some isolated lexical items and formulas - e.g. cookies, shower, I love you - mainly items relating to her home-environment. Yet she clearly understood everything said to her in English, at a level normal for English-speaking two- to three year olds. For instance, she would often repeat what was said to her in E with her own paraphrased H version, as in:

(1) Age 2:7 - Mother: Do you want to come with me?

Shelli: ani roca lavo imax*
I want (Fem) to-come with-you(Fem)

(The asterisked word differs from the more usual itax 'with-you'; this is one example of immature monolingual H usage noted further below).

Many other indicators of the child's comprehension of our E input were manifested in semantically and pragmatically appropriate responses, including such verbal responses as the following - except for the asterisked forms, all in well-formed Hebrew syntactically, morphologically, and lexically:

(2) 2:5 - M: Let's go outside. It's a beautiful day.

Sh: hayom eyn gešem baxuc
today (there's)no rain outside

2:8 - [Seeing a man go by on a tractor]

Sh: mi ze?
Who's that?

M: I don't know, I'll have to ask aba ('Daddy')

Sh: tagidi* le aba ma* še korim lo[2]
tell=ask(Fem) (to) Daddy what (that)he's called

2:9 - M: You take off your slippers before you get into bed.

Sh: hiney! yaradeti* hem*
There! I went-off they! = 'I took them off'
tiri, ani yodat levad
See,(Fem)I know(how) alone = 'by myself'

Shelli's Hebrew here is like that of other, monolingual Israeli two-to-three year olds (as attested, for instance, in Bar-Adon 1971, Dromi 1977, Berman in preparation) in both form and content. And the kind of immature forms she manifests - largely in morphology - are like those of her all Hebrew-speaking peers. These include: non-inflected forms of pronouns following prepositions - e.g. hem 'they' instead of otam = Object Marker et + hem 'them' in the last example in (2) - and incorrectly inflected pronouns - e.g. in (1), im + at 'with + you(Fem)' is not imax but itax in colloquial adult usage; use of a basic, noncausative verb-pattern where the semantic and syntactic context requires a special causative pattern, so that at age 2:9 she says yaradeti 'Intrans. I went off' in place of horadeti 'I took off' - both from the root y-r-d (a phenomenon discussed in more detail below); over-extension (in the second example of (2) above) of the question-word ma 'what' where the word ex 'how' is required in the Hebrew version of 'What's his name?'; and regularization of morphologically irregular words - e.g. at 2:7 Shelli said ha ciporim yošnim 'the birds are-sleeping' where the exceptional verb 'sleep' should take the form yašen not the paradigmatic yošen and the plural marker should be feminine -ot on the verb, not -im because the noun cipor is idiosyncratically feminine in gender though masculine in morphological form.

Stage II: Transition to English - from age 2 years 11 mos.

At age 2:11, Shelli accompanied us for a year's stay in the U.S. For the first month there, she continued to speak only Hebrew with everyone she met. Then she started attending all-day nursery school (in the regular public-school system), and within six weeks - her third month in the U.S. - she had switched to speaking entirely E. At first she retained a clearly H accent, and her E usage was below that of her H. But four months after reaching the U.S., Shelli was speaking like her American peers - in pronunciation, syntax and lexicon, and local idiomatic usage and conversational style. I unfortunately failed to document in detail the transition from Stage I of H speaking plus E understanding to Stage II of all E speaking and ultimately no H understanding. The following features were, however, noted:

a) She kept to her character of being a one-language producing child. After the short initial period of some three months at most, she would - perhaps could? - speak only E, regardless of interlocutors or other situational factors.

b) Her switch to E as her only medium of production was total, and by age 3½ she was a highly proficient user of children's American English - at least on a par with her classmates, and in some ways ahead of them, as noted by her nursery-school teachers.

c) Analogously to her former all-H production, a few isolated vocabulary items in H remained as the sole trace of her H-speaking origins. These included highly affective areas such as the words mocec 'sucker = pacifier', kaka, pipi, occasionally ima 'Mommy', rarely aba 'Daddy', and some other items she evidently talked about mainly at home - e.g. peca 'cut, sore' and šoko 'cocoa' (her favorite drink).

d) By the second half of her year in the U.S., Shelli was no longer bilingual in even the restricted sense of her Stage I. She showed intolerance of being addressed in H by anyone, including her grownup sister whose E is clearly non-native, and with Israeli visitors who thus had a hard time communicating with her. And by 3½ she seemed genuinely not to understand anything said to her in H. Thus, as Leopold (1954) says of five-year old Hildegard, "The child had turned rather resolutely to English".

Shelli thus seemed to afford a clear instance of "the phenomenon of forgetting" (other examples are cited in Hatch 1978:149 and Schmidt-Mackey 1977: 136-37) rather than a more partial "language loss" of the kind noted in Ervin-Tripp (1974). And she lends further credence to the point made by Hatch that "simultaneous and sequential acquisition of two languages is not as easy for the child as we might want to believe" (Hatch 1978 :77 and studies cited there). A crucial factor here, of course, is the all-E input the child received from her parents in Israel and subsequently throughout her year in the U.S. For clearly, Shelli's peers as well as older children spending a year in an E-speaking country whose home-background remained primarily H-speaking did not "lose" their H in this way - but neither did they reach her level of proficiency in English!

2. THE PERIOD UNDER STUDY

This study is based on detailed notes of the period following Shelli's return to Israel exactly one year after we left, at age 3:11. For the first few weeks, I noted down everything Shelli said in Hebrew, to whom, and under what circumstances. This naturally excluded the time she spent at nursery-school which she started attending 2½ weeks after her return - where she spends 5 hours a day 6 days a week with thirty 4-5 year-old monolingual Hebrew speakers, and teachers with a bare smattering of English. Information on Shelli's language use at school was obtained through reports of her teachers and schoolmates, supplemented by occasional visits of my own once every few weeks for the first 3 months. It was soon impossible to use a taperecorder to get anything like full coverage of her H output at this stage, even at home; and as details of articulation were not of concern in this study, I preferred the more convenient method of having pencil and paper wherever the child was located at a certain time. Besides, most of her speech during the first two months back in Israel - except in the occasional intimacy of her being alone with one of us, at bedtime or in her bath - was conducted against a background of considerable "noise": playing indoors and out with children and animals, in the company of numerous family and friends that filled the house during this period, and so on. Thus, the data for the first two months noted below are based on as full a handwritten record of all Shelli's H output as I could amass; From the third month (aged 4:2) until the present, I noted down all and only those utterances of Shelli's which seemed to me of interest in the subsequent development of both her languages, and added weekly tape-recordings of 30-60 minutes long of Shelli at play alone or with a friend, and in interaction with us.

Below we document some of our more salient findings, with a quite detailed account of the first weeks followed by a more general consideration of the later stages, when both H and E became equally prolific, as follows:

(3) SHELLI'S TRANSITION TO STAGE III, AS A HEBREW-ENGLISH BILINGUAL

Phase A: Months 1-2 (age 3;11-4;1) - English Dominant

Weeks 1-2: virtually no Hebrew

Weeks 3-4: Hebrew starts to be comprehended (start of school)

Weeks 5-6: Upsurge of H output

Weeks 7-8: Hebrew "clicks"

Phase B: Months 3-4 (age 4;2-4;3) - Move into Bilingualism

Phase C: Months 5-6 (age 4;4-4;5) - Establishment of Hebrew-dominant Bilingualism

Phase A: The First Two Months - English Dominant

For the first 8 or 9 weeks back in Israel, Shelli remained an English-speaking child for whom H was an incipient "second" language.

Weeks 1 - 2: Virtually no Hebrew

At first, Shelli clearly understood almost nothing of what was said to her in H. The adults around her made a great effort to communicate with her in E, even when themselves H speakers, while her peers were a source of frustration - and neither they nor Shelli enjoyed playing together. But she managed well with babies who were as yet not speaking any intelligible language, and with older girls who would pet and mother her, and who could ask others to act as their interpreters when needed.

Her H output was at this point confined to about a dozen content-words. These included: (a) words she had used all along in Hebrew, some 6 in all, such as: mocec 'pacifier', peca 'sore, cut', pipi, kaka - she had also used the euphemism 'B.M.' before - and tusik 'bottom' - which she had also used interchangeably with 'fanny' before her return to Israel; and (b) another 6 or 7 words which are highly salient in Israeli child-culture, and which Shelli had used early on, and frequently, in her original H acquisition, too, e.g., ima 'Mommy' - the H word took over almost entirely right away', aba 'Daddy' - at first in free variation with the E word - mic 'juice, pop', tiyul 'trip, outing'.

Her pronunciation at this point was very American; for instance, she articulated kartiv 'popsicle' with E-sounding /a/ and /r/. As we do not consider pronunciation any further in this study, we note here that by the end of her second month back, Shelli had started using the velar fricative /r/ of her H peers, while retaining an American /r/ in English. By age 4½, at the time of writing, Shelli has a native-sounding accent in both E and H - and it is too soon to check our guess that she may eventually start sounding rather foreign in English.

In these initial two weeks, Shelli was only marginally feeling her way into occasional Hebrew items of output. And she evinced growing comprehension of H: for instance, when a girl outside called out to her dog bo hena, ziko!, Shelli repeated the same string to me in E 'Come here, Ziko!'. Thus, she mirrored what she had formerly done in reverse, when up to age 3 she would reword E input in her "first" language, H. And the words she used in H seemed to largely recapitulate expressions she had used originally, between ages $1\frac{1}{2}$ and $2\frac{1}{2}$, and to refer to items salient in her experience - e.g. "When I start going to the gan next week", where gan = '(kinder)garden' is used rather than betsefer 'school', even though in California she had gone to "school".

Weeks 3-4: H starts to be comprehensible

The period when Shelli started school shows a clear increase in the number and type of expressions she produced in H, and in her understanding of H. This period manifested the use of numerous - 15 to 20 in all - unanalyzed formulas or ritual expressions, e.g. be+seder 'in order = okay, fine', bo hena 'come (to) here', od pam 'another time = again', layla tov 'good night', eze kef 'What fun!'. These expressions were used appropriately in expressing her feelings or reactions - according to the context that was noted down in each case - and they are typical of the kind of language which Israeli children (rather than adults) use in such contexts. It was clear that they were acquired as unanalyzed wholes; for instance, words like seder 'order', tov 'good', pam 'time', or eze 'which?' did not show up elsewhere in Shelli's output at this stage. This accords well with the findings, for instance, of Fillmore's study of 5-to-7 year-old Mexican children first acquiring American English(1978:639-649), and further suggests that the reliance on very common, as yet unanalyzed set phrases might be a necessary strategy for children trying to feel or push their way into the stream of alien speech surrounding them.

While Shelli's resources in H are very limited at this stage, the little H she does use is functionally and conceptually - and certainly stylistically - appropriate to the speech of a four-year old Israeli. For instance: when she is very excited because the neighbor's cat has just come in, she cries out yofi, yofi! 'lovely, great'; when she falls down, she cries out uf! ko'ev, ko'ev! 'Yuk! (it) hurts, hurts'; and she addresses her doll as xamuda 'darling, honey (Fem)'. Such expressions and others like them are typically interspersed in the stream of E speech, indicating that her usage is beginning to evidence a fair amount of language mixing - a topic we discuss in more detail below. Although lack of comprehensive data on her E output at this stage makes it hard to calculate, I would guess that by now some 10 to 15 percent of Shelli's speech includes some Hebrew material, as illustrated below:

(4) - "Mommy, Ziko (dog's name) is going axuca" (outside)
- "Ima (Mommy), open the delet (door) for me"
- "I'm going to the gan šaašuim (playground) with the other kids"
- "Talli (girl's name), boi (come, Fem). Come see what I did in my room"
- "lex abayta (go home), dog! Get out of our garden, kelev (dog)
- [Her father is blowing bubbles on her bubble-pipe]:
"aba, xalaš (Daddy, weak)! No, I mean the bubbles are xalašim" (weak)
[The second time the plural form xalašim is required]

We assumed that Shelli's early re-entry to H might recapitulate certain developmental patterns. By the end of a month in Israel, her total H output was too restricted to provide evidence of immature control of grammatical categories such as gender and verb-conjugation[3]. But she did at this stage use items which had showed up early in her original acquisition of H - e.g. avuca 'outside' and od 'more' as a coverall term for repetition, addition, increase, etc. And the only question-word she used in the first month in H was efo 'where'; that is, the nonoccurrence of words like matay 'when' or ex 'how', used freely in E by this time, reflects first-language patterns of information-questions (Eyal 1976).

During these first weeks, Shelli showed a brief return to a special kind of developmental jargon, not unlike what she had done in her original language-acquisition, when she had jargonized extensively from around age 10 months until well into her third year. Then she would produce long streams of "speech without words", strings of sounds with highly accentuated intonation, at first with no recognizable words, subsequently including more and more items from her conventional H lexicon, and ultimately being abandoned altogether. Back in Israel, again faced with a language situation in which her production was not adequate to her communicative needs, she started to "jargonize" again. For instance, traveling with us by car, she would sing in a kind of gibberish in which were interspersed several words and formulas from H, seemingly at random; and she would indulge in this kind of chanting-talk when "reading" a book, "talking" on the telephone, or watching a H show on television. Just as in her original jargon, these vocalizations, too, contained many H-like sounds such as a low /a/ and velar /x/, and they became increasingly interspersed with H words.

These "monologues" are not dissimilar to those noted for the Persian 6-year old Homer in Wagner-Gough's study of second language acquisition (1975); and they are a gestalt type of strategy, like the "mushmouth" speech of Peters' subject Minh (1977). Unlike these cases, however, Shelli's monologues are incomprehensible to speakers of either E or H, as well as to her bilingual parents. This is her way of saying more than she has the linguistic means of expressing appropriately (the first time round, in language in general, now - in the old-new language Hebrew), and of trying out the production of words and phrases she has picked on as salient - even though she does not yet know what they mean. Just as Shelli stopped jargonizing when she could first say a lot in H (around age 2½), in this instance, too, as the gap between what she was cognitively able to express and emotionally needful of expressing, on the one hand, and her linguistic capacities in H, on the other, began to lessen in size and intensity, her recourse to the gestalt strategy of private monologues (Peters 1977) grew less marked. By her second month back in Israel, Shelli no longer jargonized.

As for comprehension of H by the end of her first month back, Shelli felt far more at home in H surroundings, and could follow a fair amount of interaction between children at play or with adults in ritualized activities of eating, bathing, going to bed. But she was unable to understand any more extended or non-situationally anchored speech in H: She could follow little if anything of what went on during circle-time at school, and she wished to be read to only in E, and would ask for E television when faced with children's programs in H.

Thus, there is an obvious disparity between her verbal, and hence social, competence in E and the limitation of her H to the immature "here and now", concrete, activity-based situations typical of much younger children. Yet the child's overall attitude during this first month shows no evidence of distress

or tension. Two factors might account for this: The child was happy to be back in her closeknit village community, in an environment which is highly tolerant and acceptant of her; the numerous adults around, as well as younger relatives, neighbors, and playmates have great affection for her, were glad to see her home again, and willingly included her as an active participant in their interchanges and activities. Secondly, there was evidently enough balance between physical activities and game-playing with all-H interlocutors (and Shelli is a very active, outdoor child), on the one hand, and her freedom to communicate in E at all levels available to her with her parents and other adults or older children, on the other.

Weeks 5-6: Upsurge of Hebrew output

Now there was a big jump in how much H Shelli was able to understand, although she would still be read to only in E, and was irritated by H television. Her H output showed two main trends: (a) increasing use of all-H sentence-like utterances - that is, a move away from the largely formulaic expressions noted earlier to a more analytic manipulation of syntax; and (b) increased mixing of syntactic as well as strictly lexical elements.

Thus, in moving into syntax, the following examples show that Shelli can use the question-word efo 'where' and possessive markers - formed with the particle šel 'of' plus pronominal suffix - appropriately (again, examples are structurally and pragmatically well-formed except for asterisked items), both structures being acquired by monolingual H-speakers between ages 2 and 3 (see Dromi 1977).

(5) a. aba, efo at* ?
Daddy, where(are) you+Fem.

b. efo ha bayit šel+ax?
Where(is) the house of you = 'Where is your house?'
[In response to a woman-guest saying, in H, "I'm going home now"]

c. ha xatul halax la bayta* šel+o
the cat went to house-to of-his = 'to his house (towards,sic)'

d. yomuledet šel+i, lo šel+ax*
birthday of-me, not of-you(FEM) = '(It's)my birthday, not yours'
[To her uncle, who'd asked her if he could come to her party]

Moreover, expressions which were formerly rituals are incorporated into larger contexts, as with ma kara 'What happened?': Here the child says ima, ma kara? 'Mommy, what happened?' when I yell because the pot boiled over, and later the same week she calls to a friend when her frisbee went up into a tree roni, boi tiri ma kara! 'Ronnie, come see what happened!'.

Shelli is evidently using the strategy aptly defined by Fillmore (1976:649-655) as "Making the most of what you've got". Thus, she avoids a word she has not yet "got" in H - the verb for to touch - when telling a friend not to touch her doll by saying: lo, lo (le)saxek 'No, not (to)play = Don't play' and later that day she tells me to leave her blocks alone by saying lo, lo (lehit)asek 'No, not (to) mess (around)'. And, following 5(d) above, she

uses all the devices currently available to her to assure her uncle that her birthday party will be something terrific, and of course he can come by saying: ve ba yomuledet ye [=yihye] beseder, tov? 'And at the-birthday (party) will-be fine, okay?'

With this emergent H syntax in weeks 5-6, Shelli's usage does now recapitulate to some extent an early stage of her L_1 acquisition. Thus, her omission of the prefixal infinitive marker le- in the verbs for 'play' and 'mess around' in the examples given before, and of the verb-pattern prefix hit- in the latter, mirrors her one-word stage H (Berman 1977); and her overuse of feminine gender in the pronoun 'you' of 5(a) and (d) above as well as in imperatives - e.g. she uses feminine boi 'come' rather than masculine bo when telling a dog to come here - reflects how she handled gender in her early H outputs at around age two (Berman 1979). Her syntax is also, predictably, somewhat telegraphic - e.g. when petting her doll, she omits the prefixal ha- 'the' before the word for 'baby', saying o,o, miskena, tinoket boxa 'oh, oh, poor (thing), ∅ baby is-crying' - although she does already use prepositions mastered by the normal H-speaking three-year old such as ba- 'in, at' (e.g. ima, ani po, ba bayit 'Mommy, I'm here, at home') and al 'on' (ze camid, al ha yad, po, po 'It's (a) bracelet, on the=my hand, here, here'). Besides, certain structural properties of Hebrew - such as its lack of an indefinite article, the fact that there is no overt form of the verb 'to be' in present tense, and nondistinction between present simple and progressive, make many of the two-year old Israeli child's utterances fully well-formed, where their English counterparts would be telegraphic(Rabinowitch 1974). And, again in accordance with what has been observed for H speakers between age 2 to 3, Shelli by her sixth week back in Israel is achieving productive control of the complex morphological system of H noted in fn. 3: She uses the correct future form of the verb when saying ani avo od me'at 'I will-come (in a)little while' and inflects both verbs correctly when telling me ani roca kcat mayim li+štot 'I want some water to+drink'.

In sum, then, the upsurge of H output in weeks 5-6 manifests a use of syntax and morphology beyond that of the earliest two-word stage for H-speaking children, consistent with the forms of children aged around 2½ to 3 rather than those of her four-year old monolingual peers. Moreover, not surprisingly, in view of the very reduced nature of her H input at this stage, Shelli's H vocabulary is far more restricted and immature than that of her E. But she does now begin to manifest increased mixing in of syntactic and not only lexical elements in her stream of speech, at least every fourth or fifth utterance containing some element of H, as briefly illustrated below.

(6) a. Ziko, go home! Come habayit* šelax*
the house of you+Fem = 'your house'
[Should be: la+bayit šelxa 'to your+Masc. house']

b. ima, efo ha scissors šeli ?
Mommy, where the of me = 'Where are my scissors'

c. ima, let's fold them [=napkins] kaxa ('this way')

d. I want od pam ('again') go to sleep' = 'back to sleep'

e. lo roca ('(I) don't want) go to school

f. I'm going li+šon ('to sleep) now'

In these and other such mixings, the syntax is appropriate for most of the H material inserted - an exception is noted in 6(a); there is much variability, in the sense that on the same day she would use parallel expressions once in H and once in E - e.g. with 'I want' and 'to sleep' in 6(d) through (f) - clear evidence in our opinion that she is only just beginning to move into the H formulations; and her E already seems somewhat affected, as she omits the infinitival marker before 'go' in both 6(d) and (e). This seems to anticipate what happens to the child's English over the next two months (from week 7 on), when nearly every E utterance is interspersed with large amounts of H material. The pattern of her mixing is more fully analyzed in the section which follows.

Weeks 7-8: Hebrew "clicks"

This period saw a dramatic shift on Shelli's part into the linguistic usage and behavior patterns of a "bilingual", as someone who is more or less equally at home in two languages. This was when we noticed "the suddenly acquired fluency and facility with the target language" characterized by Lamendella (1977:185) as the process of "clicking" or the point of "nucleation", where all kinds of accumulating data comes to form a kind of "knowledge [which] 'clicks' and is thereafter available for use in natural-style communication" (Lamendella 1977).

As accords with the nature of "nucleation", H is still a "target language" for Shelli. She is far less proficient in H than in E: in the topics she can and does talk about, size and range of lexicon, and grammatical wellformedness. Thus, her use of gender in pronouns, verbs, and adjectives (all entailing concord with other constituents) is inconsistent and often incorrect - e.g. she uses the unmarked masculine forms of the adjectives in saying of herself ani lo gadol, ani katan 'I'm not big, I'm small' rather than feminine gdola, ktana respectively; she produces only one or two forms of any given verb, lacking as yet command of the full range of inflectionally marked distinctions for person, number, tense, as well as gender; [4] she sometimes still uses a free form of preposition + (nominative case) pronoun rather than the inflected, oblique form - e.g. tasimi ha buba al ani 'put+Imper. the doll on I (sic)' instead of the fused form alay 'on me'. These are consistent with the type of errors noted for H-speaking two to three-year-olds (see references in fn. 3), as is her omission of the preposition al literally 'on' governed by the verb for 'to look' when she says: tistakli Ø šaršeret šeli 'look+Fem-Imper (at) my necklace'. That is, Shelli is still "acquiring" Hebrew.

However, this is the stage of "clicking", for now Shelli has moved into the production of all-H utterances, and the conduct of all-H conversations and other communicative interchanges (e.g. playing on her own with her dolls). Her use of mixed speech now manifests the converse of the pattern noted during her first six weeks in Israel, when an occasional H word or phrase would crop up in the stream of E speech. This is illustrated below, where we note that the words interspersed in E are of the cognitively and syntactically complex category of relational conjunctions - the one main single class of words she could not as yet come out with in H. (Again, H is well-formed except where asterisked).

(7) a. [To the older girl she walks to school with; Bina is her teacher.]
im bina lo kan*, then ani olex* la gan šelax, tov?
if Bina isn't here, ——— I go+Masc. to your school, okay?
(kan 'here' should be šam 'there';
olex 'go,goes' should be Fem. olexet or Fut. elex)

b. [To the little girl next door, walking back home across the lawn.]

ani lo baa	[le]saxek*	itax	because	ani lo xavera šelax
I'm not coming	(to)play	with-you		I'm not your friend

c. [telling me she's going to visit her aunt Miriam across the road]

ani lo lavo*	axšav,	but	miryam	bring	oti od me'at,	tov?
I'm not to-come	now,		Miriam		me soon,	okay?

Despite a few asterisked forms - in 7(b) the infinitival prefix le- is missing, and in (c) the infinitive form lavo replaces the required future avo 'I'll come' - such utterances show how much, and how effectively, Shelli can by now communicate in Hebrew. She started using the verb for 'bring' - in 7(c) requiring the future form tavi - just a few days later, although relational markers like az 'then', kiy, biglal še- 'because' as well as aval 'but' were in general slower in appearing.

Two other properties first manifested themselves towards the end of Phase A - the initial two months - both indicating that the child had by then achieved a "cognitive separation of the two systems" (Swain & Wesche 1975:17). These were, firstly, interlocutor-sensitivity: Once H "clicked", she would use it alone with children, including in her version of "baby-talk" with young babies, in role-playing, and with animals: when at play on her own - with her dolls, stuffed animals, blocks, puzzles, etc; and when with any person she perceives as H speaking. She now occasionally turns to her parents (both of us very proficient in H) in H, as in 7(c) above, but she refuses to talk H to anyone who addresses her in poor or nonfluent H (as with an aunt from England); and although Shelli's babysitter tried to communicate with her in her very minimal E, the child would insist on using H with her as far as she was able. Secondly, for the first time in her history, Shelli started code-switching widely. For instance, at lunch with her babysitter, she used only H - but switched to E as soon as I walked in; she was playing with a schoolfriend in her room in H - then left the room to ask me something in E; she had a long make-believe talk with her father and then her grandmother on her toy telephone in E - then started up a conversation with a friend in H. And, within the confines of her H at this stage, the switch is total; articulation, intonation, the very tone of speech change with the language and the interlocutors to whom each is suited.

Phase B: 3rd and 4th Months - Move into Bilingualism

Within four months of her return to Israel, Shelli was for the first time truly bilingual, communicating in both languages in a way described below.

Functioning in two codes: Language dominance, mixing, and code switching

Shelli's move into bilingualism in months 3 and 4 offers insight into the complex notion of dominance in a bilingual situation. On the one hand, H is clearly quantitatively dominant in the child's usage: She uses H with more people, under more circumstances, and in more situations; and her E output is increasingly restricted to her parents and a few other adults on condition, as noted before, that they have at least native-like command of E. When she

plays on her own, chances are about equal which language she will use - although by the next stage, within half a year of being back in Israel, when talking to herself or role-playing, H will have taken over almost entirely.

During months 3 and 4, however, E is in some sense still "dominant". Thus, her command of E is clearly superior to her H in grammatical correctness and in range of vocabulary. There is also evidence that E is dominant in cognitive-conceptual terms, by contrast with the situational factors governing her wide range of H usage in terms of sheer amount. Thus, when questioning me about semantic equivalents, asking what word X is in E - e.g."Ima, how do you say pina (corner) in English?" or "What's met (dead) in English?" - she is asking for an explanation, she wants to know what the H words mean. When, however, she asks the same question in reverse - e.g. "How do you say 'mauve' (=segol) in Hebrew?" or "What's 'memory-game' (=misxak hazikaron) in Hebrew?" - she needs to know how to talk about that referent in H. From this point of view, then, E is clearly her L_1 - her source language - and H is her target. However, as we note later in this section, from yet another point of view, the reverse seems to obtain: the bulk of her "interference" errors were from H into E, indicating that in this sense, H is her source language!

It thus appears that there are at least three inter-related facets to the nature of bilingual dominance: quantity of situational exposure and variety of contexts of use; linguistic knowledge and proficiency; and cognitive processing and the nature of bilingual strategies. Our prediction that on all three counts Shelli will be Hebrew-dominant within a year of her return to Israel - certainly in two or three years time with the onset of formal H schooling and literacy - is borne out by the extent to which H had "taken over" along all three dimensions even by the time of writing - the second half of her first year back in Israel.

Further evidence of "imbalance" between the two systems is provided by the child's pattern of language mixing, as charted below.

(8)

PHASE A:	1st 6 weeks "move into L_2"	- Steady increase in use of H words, then whole phrases, in E stream of speech, plus more and more all-H utterances
	Weeks 7-8 "clicking"	- Constant mixing of H elements in E speech, plus occasional use of isolated E words in all-H utterances
PHASE B:	Months 3-4 "bilingual"	- Constant, more extensive use of H in E stream of speech, no further use of E words in H speech

That is, in terms of the bilingual strategy of mixing, Hebrew is dominant from Phase B: The child by now comes out more and more rarely with E utterances that are totally free of H material, but she never mixes E into her H any more . Our data from Shelli suggests that the following distinction is relevant: (a) Language mixing [5] is evidence of linguistic inadequacy on the part of the second language learner - as in the cases of teenager Ricardo and adult Rafaela reported in Hatch (1978:428-430) and elsewhere[6]. It reflects indeterminate separation of the two systems; lower recall ability for items in the less dominant language; or sheer lack of knowledge of items in the language being spoken. (For a similar account of the reasons for mixing, based on data from three children reared as bilinguals, see Volterra & Taeschner 1978). By contrast,

(b) code switching reflects "a communicative skill, which speakers use as a verbal strategy much in the same way that skillful writers switch styles in a short story" (Gumperz 1970:136). It is a form of "register-shifting" which reflects the kind of sensitivity shown by a four-year old child in adjusting his own speech to his interlocutors, and in using different speech styles with babies, peers, parents, or teachers.

Thus, as a mother and a linguist, I would like Shelli to evince eventually avoidance of mixing combined with skillful, socially and communicatively appropriate recourse to code switching between E and H. By the end of her fourth month back, although she continued to mix excessively (in one direction only, as noted), she showed increased competence in her use of switching. For instance, playing with a schoolfriend, she did as follows:

(9) Shelli: Ima, Michal wants to ride my bike inside the house.

Mother: Okay, she can.

Shelli: mixal, at yexola, ima šeli omeret še ze beseder
Michal, you can, my Mommy says that it's alright

In this exchange, Shelli's H is on a par with that of her peers, and in code-switching she shows she is able to do what Swain & Wesche (1975) call "spontaneous translating" - just as was noted for her original H acquisition in Section 1 of this paper.

As for the content of her mixing, of H into E, we noted only one incidental instance of intra-word "blending" when she used the English suffix -ing with the present-tense form, unmarked masculine, of the H verb for 'draw, paint', saying: "I haven't finished mecayering yet". This is clearly very marginal in Shelli's usage as well as in bilingual children in general (Lindholm & Padilla 1978 note 4 such instances in the 110 cases of Spanish-English mixing observed in their corpus of over 5000 utterances), providing strong evidence for nonseparation of the two systems, and hence inadequacy in both.

Shelli's mixing of H into E was so widespread in these two months, that I was unable to document what might be considered a representative sample, let alone a full list of such occurrences. The following factors seemed, however, to emerge, with more structural properties of her mixing being largely consistent with what has been noted in the literature (as surveyed and reappraised for instance by Lipski 1978). There was some indication that introduction of L_y material into the stream of L_x speech may be accompanied by various kinds of hesitation phenomena (see, too, Swain & Wesche 1975); H phrases were often triggered by a cognate, or name, or term she used only in H - e.g. "Ima, pretend this is the telefon šel hagan"(school telephone), "Maybe at night rika šomeret aleyhem"(looks after them), "I don't care if all the kids shout at me at gan. ma xpat lahem? " (...school. What do they care?); and in general she would use only H for words which were in some sense salient to her - either perceptually as in the above examples, or emotionally, as in her invariant use of the H miflecet 'monster' in her E speech as soon as she had acquired the word.

That is, in months 3 and 4, and subsequently in months 5 and 6, too, her emergent bilingualism meant she interspersed H into her E speech as follows: with single lexical contentives by now more salient to her in H; as a follow-

on from utterances started in E but switched midway to H; and in whole strings in H as, within a given situation, she switches from E to H and back again.

Nature of errors in H and E during months 3-4

As Shelli moved into bilingualism, she made two main types of errors differentially for her two languages: a) Her H was still immature, with predominantly developmental - mainly morphological - errors, like those of H monolinguals before the age of three; and b) her E showed signs of increasing interference from H - mainly syntactic - patterns, whereas there was virtually no impingement of E forms on her H usage.

a) Developmental errors in H were mainly of the following kinds:
(i) Immature pronunciations in the form of reductions and permutations similar to her original H acquisition; e.g. parenthesized elements were omitted in anaxnu (me)saxkim ve mišto(le)lim 'we're playing and having-fun' and she says lo liklakti ta sefer '(I did)n't spoil the book' where the verb is kilkalti;

(ii)Incorrect inflection assignment, including over-regularizations - e.g. *tinokim 'babies' with the regular -im plural suffix rather than the required feminine form in tinokot - or saying yikra 'will-read', with an abstract root-final glottal stop, instead of yikre 'will-happen' with an abstract root-final /h/, both abstract phonemes being realized as zero in most adult H speech;

(iii) Use of free nominative forms of pronouns following prepositions rather than the required suffixal form - e.g. *alyad ani 'next-to I' = alyadi and *bišvil hu 'for he' = bišvilo;

(iv) Use of more basic, general verbs rather than the more appropriate specific verb - e.g. halxu 'went' in both hem halxu me ha xalon 'they went from the window, cf. yac'u derex 'went-out = exited through', or ima ve aba halxu le telaviv 'Mommy and Daddy went to Tel Aviv', cf. nas'u 'went (by vehicle)';

(v) Use of an inappropriate verb-pattern with the correct verb-root and inflections, including non-use of causative verbs where required by context - e.g. ima toxli oti 'Mommy, eat me' vs. ta'axili 'feed' or ex lacet zot 'how to-go-out this?' for 'How do I take [=lehoci] this out?'; use of intransitive verbs where a transitive is required - e.g. tiri ex ani mistovevet etze 'watch how I'm turning(Intrans.) this' instead of the transitive mesovevet to describe what she is doing to the spinning-top, as well as a more basic, transitive verb when an intransitive is required - e.g. elex lišon še ha seret gomer 'I'll-go to-sleep when the movie is-finishing' instead of nigmar 'is-finished, over'.

All such examples are found in the speech of younger, 2 to 3-year-old H speakers,too. The tendency to use one invariant verb-pattern with a given verb-root noted in (v) above is particularly interesting , firstly because the use of noncausative forms occurred in Shelli's English, too - e.g. at age 3½ she said: "I want you to wear me this dress because it sees [=shows] my freckle" - and is characterized in depth for her own child's English by Bowerman (1974); secondly, the ability to use a variety of morphological verb-patterns to ex-

press such notions as causativity, transitivity vs. intransitivity, active-passive-middle voice distinctions, reflexive, reciprocal, or inchoative is a clear indicator of more highly developed acquisition of H, which stabilizes at around age five - and is much better established in the speech of Shelli's peers than in her own H at age 4.2-4.3.

b) Interference errors were, as noted, rare in Shelli's Hebrew output. Only the following instances were observed all through months 3 to 6: (i) She quite consistently in months 3 to 4, but not subsequently, used the preposition bišvil 'for' in contexts where H requires the dative-benefactive prefix le- 'to' and 'for' - e.g. boi nexake bišvil rega 'let's wait for (a) minute'. (ii) She often used the H version of the E carry-all verb for 'put' rather than the appropriate lexical item in H - e.g. at sama oti li+šon 'you're putting me to+sleep' instead of at maškiva oti 'you're laying-down me' and ani asim levad et habegadim 'I'll put (on) alone my clothes' instead of ani etlabeš levad 'I'll dress+Reflexive alone=by myself'. Such forms are interesting because it is in the use of single words lexicalized within the verb-pattern morphology of the language that H verb usage differs quite systematically from E, with its very general tendency to use "carry-all" verbs such as get, make, put with a noun. (iii) She occasionally translated other lexical items literally - e.g. toridi et haor 'take-down the light' instead of the appropriate H verb texabi 'extinguish= put out', a loan-translation exactly analagous to an Italian-German instance reported in Volterra & Taeschner 1978, or ani ekra lax ba+telefon 'I'll call you on+the phone' where the verb should be acalcel 'I'll ring'.

Thus, the transfer of E patterns into the child's H was rare and short-lived, indicating that E did not constitute an important point of reference for her re-entry into H - particularly in view of the fact that her re-emergent H manifested native H-like developmental patterns as noted in a) above. Moreover, the main type of E-interference error was lexical rather than syntactic, taking the form of loan-translations typically made by adult E speakers when learning H as a second language, too.

By contrast, from her third month back in Israel and persistently since then, Shelli's E has come to manifest numerous errors which are clearly rooted in H. Such errors are increasingly more common, they are quite systematic, and are often syntactic in nature, and they are not the kind of errors which showed up in Shelli's English during the period she spent in the U.S.[8] They include:

(i) Occasional, sporadic lexical translations - e.g. "You're the doctor, she's the nurse, and I'm the sick" - ha+xole 'the sick' also meaning 'the patient';

(ii) Neutralization of the do-make distinction, both rendered by the H verb asa - e.g. "So now I'm the Mommy and I'm doing the cake", "See what a beautiful house I did with my blocks", "I'm doing for you a farm to all the animals";

(iii) Systematic neutralization of the dative-benefactive to/for distinction, both rendered by prefixal le- in H, is illustrated in the last example in (ii);

(iv) Systematic use of H type infinitival complements on verbs taking a gerund in E or a that clause complement in H - e.g. "When I finish to do that, I'll tell you", "Why don't you give (=let) me to climb up there?", or "I want that you'll feed me", all direct translations from H structures with these verbs;

(v) Systematic insertion of that corresponding to the H subordinator še- after conjunctions - e.g. "I'll read the story how that I want to", "I'm gonna hide where that you can't find me", "But I don't understand what that he's saying";

(vi) Increasing use of word-order favored in H but impossible in E, with fronting of indirect and oblique objects, particularly when pronominal - e.g. "I'm doing (sic) for you a beautiful picture", "But he's taking from me all my blocks", "Look how that (sic) I make from this a house";

(vii) Common use of the human-reference pronouns he and she in place of it agreeing with the gender of the source-noun in Hebrew - e.g. "So this monster came and she was very ugly" (cf. fem. miflecet 'monster') or "Don't read me that story, he's not interesting (cf. masc. sipur 'story');

(viii) Use of be + to in possessives, on the pattern of H, a non-habere language - e.g. (age 4;2) "You know, to my sister there's a baby, and he's a boy!", (age 4;3) "So when will be to my cat puppies, I mean kittens?" in the sense of 'When will my cat have kittens?', while at age 4;6 we had this interchange:

(10) Shelli: Right that there isn't to you another little girl?

Mother: What? (requesting clarification)

Shelli: Right that you don't have another little girl?

As this example indicates, Shelli does "know" the appropriate E form, and can produce it when she is using her "monitor" (in the sense of Krashen 1976). However, although both her earlier all-E use of these forms and her ability to correct herself when prompted show that the appropriate forms are available to her in E, her very consistent and systematic use of the Hebraized forms right through to months 5 and 6 indicates that the latter might be taking on the character of "fossilized" interlanguage forms in her E in general. The child's H interference errors seem to us significant because: They are so consistent, and persistent, in her bilingual use of E; they exactly reflect the kind of errors made by H speaking high-school students studying E as a second language; and they indicate that H has turned into a source language for her E, rather than the other way around that in this sense, at least, H is now "dominant" for her.

Phase C: 5th and 6th Months - Establishment of Bilingualism

Within half a year of her return to Israel, Shelli was an established bilingual, the interaction between her two languages emerging as follows:

a) She uses both languages fluently and easily, at a level appropriate to the norm for her age and general stage of development, although her standard of expression is very slightly richer and more sophisticated in E than in H - a distinction we predict will be neutralized, and perhaps weighted in the opposite direction, by the time the year is out.

b) Her code-switching in terms of interlocutor is complete by now: She uses all H with H speakers, all E with non-H speakers, and mixes H into her stream of E speech with people like her parents, whom she knows to be proficient in H though they interact with her in E. This accords with what is known of the four-year-old's cognitive-social ability to adjust his usage different-

ially in his linguistic interaction with younger children, peers, older siblings, parents, schoolteachers, etc.

c) H is well on the way to being her dominant language, in the following senses at least: Insofar as she has continued with language-mixing, she will intersperse H items and whole phrases into the stream of E speech, not vice versa; she uses H quantitatively more than E, in more situations - school, playground, going visiting, on the street, and in our village - and with more people - including her adult siblings, her regular babysitter, friends, teachers, neighbors; she uses H when she is alone, at play with her dolls, drawing in her room, in her bath, and in all role-playing and "let's pretend" situations; she has moved totally into H child-culture - in all ritualized activities or language-play, of games, counting out, singing songs, making up rhymes, she uses only H; and, finally, "fossilized" types of interlanguage errors in her E show evidence of the interference of H patterns of usage and grammatical forms, whereas by now there is virtually no E interference in her H usage.

d) The pattern of Shelli's mixing, as traced for the first 4 months in (8) above, shows that despite her having in a sense been like a second language learner of H in the period under study, her developmental sequence was similar to that of children who are bilinguals from birth. At first, she interspersed occasional lexical items in the stream of E; then she would switch languages quite "smoothly, apparently unconsciously, and without translation of what (s)he had said before" in mid-sentence (Swain & Wesche 1975:19), "showing extraordinary skill at passing from one language to another during the same verbal interaction" (Volterra & Taeschner 1978:320). Our assumption, in keeping with the findings of these and other studies, is that eventually, when she is a truly competent bilingual, this language-mixing will disappear. Should she continue to mix H into her E speech as she does now, she will be on a par with the adult E-H bilinguals described in fn. 6 above, who acquired H long after their first language, English.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Two complex and interrelated patterns emerge in the interaction between the child's two languages: (i) social and pragmatic factors of exposure to each language, its relative prestige in the community, and its importance for purposes of identification and belonging; and (ii) linguistic and cognitive factors relating to the structural properties of the two codes, the maturational level of the child in acquiring each language, and general availability and retrievability of items in one language or another in terms of both immediate verbal context and of long-term memory storage.

If we compare Shelli's entry into all-English usage from around age 3, as outlined in Section 1 above, with her re-entry into Hebrew in the period under study (ages 3:11 to 4:5), the former process seemed in some sense easier and swifter than the latter. Two factors along the linguistic-cognitive axis seem to account for this. Firstly, when we came to the U.S., Shelli knew E - even though she did not speak it; all she had to do was put into operation her language-producing mechanism, formerly functional for H alone, in order to speak E at

an appropriate three-year-old level. Her task was thus analogous to that of children who start to speak relatively late, who have a lengthy latency period in their first language: Once they do start speaking, their usage is on a par with that of their peers. With regard to H, however, Shelli "left" it at age 3, re-entered it at age 4 - and the gap in her H exposure thus corresponded exactly to a period crucial in achieving native tongue proficiency.

As for social and pragmatic factors, Shelli's environment in the U.S. was far more fully English than the mixed E-H situation she had known till the age of three. Back in Israel, she did not have to adjust to new surroundings or new faces to any great extent; and her home-village situation was highly receptive and encouraging to her. In the U.S., however, moving over to E was part of her winning entry into an entirely new world - at school, with neighbors and family friends, and on the street. E was the norm to which she needed to adjust and, aided by her prior exposure, she did so rapidly and totally.

Here in Israel, she moved back into H with no great signs of stress or conflict, but she could and did take at least six months to do so - secure in her knowledge that whatever and however she speaks, she has been accepted or "integrated" all along. Thus she can and does relate to knowing an extra language as something enjoyable, rather than as a source of any negative kind of "being different"; She can "show off" with friends by addressing adults in E, by being able to follow stories and television programs in E and then explaining to others. Moreover, unlike the children in many of the bilingual case-studies observed in the literature, both of Shelli's parents are native in E, and it is thus quite natural for us to use E with her as well as with each other, while being fully integrated, through our fluent H, in the society around.

Thus, Shelli's painless re-entry to H was facilitated by her own personality as a gregarious and self-confident child as well as by maximal social reinforcements in the environment. In summing up cognitive and linguistic features of this process, it is hard to judge the precise significance of her prior knowledge of H, up until age 3, as detailed comparative data of similar situations are not available. Clearly, her age was to her advantage: She is still well within the optimally "receptive period" for acquiring language, given, moreover, that she had been exposed to H during her "pre-receptive" period, too (in the sense of Lamendella 1977:168). Where she took the longest, relatively, was in vocabulary-enrichment and in gaining mastery of complex patterns of H morphological structure - knowledge she would normally have acquired during the year she spent in E, between age three and four. But she very rapidly started to talk about the things and to use language for the pragmatic purposes normal to a four-year old, moving very efficiently into Israeli child-culture via her re-acquired Hebrew.

Finally, insofar as Shelli's re-entry into H can be taken as an instance of second language acquisition, her case supports those who would wish to equate first language and second language acquisition - for her H, particularly in the months 3 to 4 phase of "moving into bilingualism", was replete with errors typical of children acquiring H as their first, and only, language. On the other hand, this may have merely been the result of her squashing into three or four months what her monolingual peers had had a full year to gain command of. Moreover, Shelli's systematic use of H constructions in her E speech widely reflects the E learned formally as a second language by Israeli adolescents. On all counts, then, within six months it was E which had "second language" status.

NOTES

*I am grateful to Esther Dromi, Evelyn Hatch, and Loraine Obler for their very helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

[1]Since the early, pioneering work of Bar-Adon on Hebrew child language (in an unpublished doctoral dissertation in Hebrew, 1959, summed up in Bar-Adon 1971), the field has suffered from a dearth of detailed, descriptive studies. Our data on Hebrew language-acquisition is based on unpublished studies of my own and of my students at Tel Aviv University, as well as unpublished master's theses noted in the bibliography (e.g. Dromi 1977, Eyal 1976, Rabinowitch 1974).

[2]The imperative (appropriately feminine) form tagidi occurs instead of 'ask' in the sense of 'inquire' (H has a different verb for 'ask' = 'request'),which should here be tišali. This confusion between tell and ask accords with the findings of Carol Chomsky (1969) and of Ziv (1976) for older English and Hebrew-speaking children respectively. And in fact, Shelli continued to use "tell" instead of "ask" in such directives for the next few months in both E and in H.

[3]H has a much richer, more complex system of inflectional morphology than E, and 2 to 3-year old Israeli children do not have full control of the system. By age 3-4, they generally have mastered most of it, except for occasional anomalous forms - e.g. nouns with masculine form but feminine gender, verbs with highly opaque consonantal roots, etc. By age four, Shelli's command of E morphology was complete, except that (i) she still regularized past tense forms to yield hitted, singed, etc., and (ii) she often neutralized the distinction between causative-transitive verbs and their more basic, intransitive counterparts in different contexts - much as described for her children by Bowerman (1974).

[4]Shelli's H in this transitional stage is reminiscent of that of adult immigrants to Israel who never acquire more than a pidginized kind of H, even after many years in the country. Morphologically, this "dialect", like Shelli's at this point, manifests two seemingly opposite features: (i) extreme variability of form, indicating a lack of clear differentiation of systematic differences between markers of such categories as tense, gender, number, person, voice, etc.; and (ii) a certain invariance of form, one alternative - e.g. the imperative or infinitive of a verb, the feminine form of a noun - is used in all environments, regardless of syntactic or semantic appropriateness. In the development of H-speaking children, the invariance of (ii) is manifested only very early on, mainly at the one-word stage, being followed by a short period of the kind of fluctuating forms of (i) during the emergence of initial syntax. Older, unsuccessful second language learners of H, however, resort largely to strategy (ii) of fossilized invariants.

[5]We consider the distinction made by Lindholm & Padilla between language mixes as "interaction that occurs within a sentence boundary" and switching as "an interaction which occurs at the sentence boundary" (1977:271) to be rather too mechanistic. A more flexible distinction is suggested by Swain & Wesche (1975), who characterize lexical mixing as "utterances in which words from both languages were used" as compared with "the points at which language switching from French to English or English to French occurred" (1975:17).

[6]There is ample evidence that well-established bilinguals do engage in language-mixing, too. Thus, there are many people in our village (including Shelli's father!) who came to Israel around 30 years ago, when in their early twenties. They - like other Anglo-Israeli longtimers in this country - constantly intersperse H lexical items into the E they use when speaking to one another; many of them use H when talking E not only to refer to institutional features of their life most salient to them in H, including culturally untranslateable concepts, but even when referring to objects and activities which have quite straightforward E counterparts. This is clearly a kind of "mixing" which causes laymen to contend that people who know two languages do not have full command of either! However, analagously to Shelli's subsequent development in the two languages, these adult bilinguals will not introduce E words into their H stream of speech; although their Israeli interlocutors might understand such elements in E, such speakers seem to want to prove that their H, clearly a "second language" both chronologically and in terms of overall proficiency and literacy level when compared with their E, is in fact fully under their control. Secure in their native E, such speakers manifest cultural identification - perhaps a kind of "laziness" - by interspersing it with lots of H words. And this "mixing" is clearly a performance kind of phenomenon, not due to lack of knowledge of the E items in any simple sense: Thus, when traveling abroad, or even in Israel with people who know no H, their E speech becomes considerably "purified"; even though they occasionally still evince difficulty in retrieving the appropriate word or phrase in E, they can when necessary produce fully E speech.

[7]Other such blends noted in English-Hebrew bilingual 3 to 4-year-olds include: ranti for 'I ran' - English 'run' + Hebrew past tense first person suffix -ti; mafida 'feed + Fem', tafliši 'flush (the toilet) + Fem.Imper.', where the English consonants f,d and f,l, š respectively are inserted in the Hebrew pattern of ma+C(C)iC+a and ta+CCiC+i, the C in each case representing a root consonant in Hebrew; and, observed in the same child on different days, use of the Hebrew plural suffix -im with an English word to yield pičim for 'peaches' and of the English -s with a Hebrew word to yield zayits for 'olives' - cf. zayit '(an) olive' / zeytim 'olives'.

[8]The types of errors manifested in Shelli's E when we left the U.S., and persisting up to the time of writing, include: (i) Continued over-regularization of past-tense forms noted in fn. 3, as well as occasional non-distinction between causative and non-causatives like eat-feed or learn-teach; (ii) Non-analysis of be as a main verb - e.g. "At gan ('school') we pretend, and Orit be's the baby and I be the Mommy", "Now you gotta be be careful", or "By why won't he be be ready yet?"; and (iii) Sporadic inversion of Subject-Aux in embedded questions as well as some non-inversion of Subject-Aux in more complex main-clause questions - e.g. "I don't know why can't Oren come" or "When my dolly needs to have her bath?"

REFERENCES

Bar-Adon, Aaron, 1971. Primary syntactic structures in Hebrew child language. In: Bar-Adon, Aaron & Werner F. Leopold, eds. Child Language: A Book of Readings. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 433-472.

Berman, Ruth,1977. Natural phonological processes at the one-word stage. Lingua 43, 1-21.

-----, 1979. Early verbs: How and why a child uses his first words. International Journal of Psycholinguistics 12.

-----,in preparation. Acquisition of morphology by Hebrew-speaking children: Developmental evidence for language structure and language change. Manuscript.

Bowerman, Melissa, 1974. Learning the structure of causative verbs: A study in the relationship of cognitive, semantic, and syntactic development. Papers on Child Language Development, 8, Stanford University, 142-178.

Chomsky, Carol, 1969. The Acquisition of Syntax in Children from 5 to 10. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press.

Dromi,Esther,1977. The MLU as a measure of language-development in Hebrew-speaking 2-3 year-olds. Unpublished master's thesis, Tel Aviv University. (In Hebrew)

Ervin-Tripp, Susan, 1974. Is second language learning like the first? TESOL Quarterly 8, 2, 111-127.

Eyal, Sara, 1976. The acquisition of interrogative utterances by Hebrew-speaking children. Unpublished master's thesis, Tel Aviv University. (In Hebrew)

Fillmore, Lily Wong,1976. The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Gumperz,John, 1970. Verbal strategies in multilingual communication. In: Alatis,J., ed. Georgetown Monographs on Languages & Linguistics 23, 129-147.

Hatch, Evelyn, 1978, ed. Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings. Rowley: Mass: Newbury House.

Krashen, Stephen,1976. Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. TESOL Quarterly 10, 157-168.

Lamendella, John,1977. General principles of neurofunctional organization and their manifestation in primary and nonprimary language acquisition. Language Learning 27, 155-196.

Leopold, Werner, 1954. A child's learning of two languages. Georgetown University Monographs on Languages & Linguistics 7, 19-30.

Lindholm, K.L. & A.M. Padilla, 1977. Bilingual children's use of language mixing and switching. In: Henning, Carol A.,ed. Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum, UCLA, June 1977, 270-280.

-----, 1978. Language mixing in bilingual children. Journal of Child Language 5, 327-335.

Lipski, John M., 1978. Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In: Paradis, Michel, ed. Aspects of Bilingualism. Columbia, S.C: Hornbeam Press, 250-264.

Peters, Anne M.,1977. Language learning strategies. Language 53,3,560-573.

Rabinowitch, Shoshana,1974. Two-word utterances of Hebrew-speaking children. Unpublished master's thesis, Tel Aviv University. (In Hebrew)

Schmidt-Mackey, Ilona,1977. Language strategies of the bilingual family. In: Mackey,W.F. & T. Andersson, eds. Bilingualism in Early Childhood. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 132-146.

Swain, Merrill & Mari Wesche,1975. Linguistic interaction: Case-study of a bilingual child. Language Sciences 37, October, 17-22.

Wagner-Gough, Judy,1975. Comparative studies in second language learning. CAL-ERIC Series on Languages & Linguistics, No. 26.

Volterra, V. & T. Taeschner,1978. The acquisition and development of language by bilingual children. Journal of Child Language 5, 311-326.

Ziv, Esther,1976. Acquisition of syntactic structures by Hebrew-speaking elementary-school children. Unpublished master's thesis, Tel Aviv University.